



Emotional Intelligence – Psychology at a Crossroads

Vaibhav P. Birwatkar

Research Scholar, PhD

vunfold@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Einstein said long ago that humankind was doomed to self-destruction unless we change how we think. Emotional intelligence is one of the most widely discussed topics in current psychology. Nearly 2 decades of research, there still appears to be little consensus over how emotional intelligence should be conceptualized or assessed and the efficacy of practical applications in real life settings. The term "emotional intelligence" refers to the ability to adaptively perceive, understand, regulate, and harness emotions in the self and others. Experiments show that identifying and managing emotions helps with cognition, task performance and social relationships. Reliable psychological tests for emotional intelligence have been developed, allowing emotional skills to be correlated with life outcomes and distinguished from the dimensions of personality.

This paper aims at providing a snapshot of conceptualization of the mind, its functions, and primary motivators, including a brief analysis of the relationship between thoughts, emotions and desires.

Key words: Emotional intelligence, emotional affects, multiple Intelligences, amygdala, unconscious emotions

Introduction

The study of intelligence and mechanism of human brains has fascinated many educators, psychologists and researchers for the last two decades. This is mainly because intelligence has always been associated with the ability to achieve and succeed both academically and professionally.



What is intelligence? Gardner (1999) defines an intelligence as "the biopsychological potential to process information that can be activated in a cultural setting to solve problems or create products that are of value in a culture". Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso's model draws upon a psychometric tradition that an intelligence must meet three criteria to be defined as such. The proposed intelligence must be conceptual (that is, it must reflect mental aptitudes rather than behaviors), it must be correlational (that is, it must share similarities with yet remain distinct from other established intelligences), and it must be developmental (that is, the aptitudes that characterize it must increase with an individual's experience and age). Mayer et al. demonstrate that emotional intelligence meets these criteria.

What is emotion or feeling? Campos et al. (1994) defines emotions as "those processes which establish, maintain, change, or terminate the relation between the person and the environment on matters of significance to the person". In real life, purely logical search through all possibilities is not possible (because of limitations of resources, multiple goals, and problems of coordination with others). This is why emotions or something like them are necessary to bridge across the unexpected and unknown, to guide reason, and to give priorities among multiple goals. What emotions really are, are the guiding structures of our lives especially of our relations with others. Feeling refers to "any of the subjective reactions, pleasant or unpleasant" that one may experience in a situation.

An emotion is usually caused by a person consciously or unconsciously evaluating an event as relevant to a concern (a goal) that is important; the emotion is felt as positive when a concern is advanced and negative when a concern is impeded. The core of an emotion is readiness to act and the prompting of plans; an emotion gives priority for one or a few kinds of actions to which it gives a sense of urgency - so it can interrupt, or compete with, alternative mental processes or actions. Different types of readiness create different outline relationships with others. An emotion is usually experienced as a distinctive type of mental state, sometimes accompanied or followed by bodily changes, expressions, actions.

Given these understandings, how might "emotional intelligence" be provisionally conceptualized? Most simply, emotional intelligence can reasonably be conceived as a measure of the degree to which a person successfully (or unsuccessfully) applies sound judgment and reasoning to situations in the process of determining emotional or feeling responses to those situations. It would entail, then, the bringing of (cognitive) intelligence to bear upon emotions. It would encompass both positive and negative emotions. It would be a measure of the extent to which our affective responses were "rationally" based. A person with a high degree of emotional intelligence would be one who responded to situations with feeling states that "made good sense," given what was going on in those situations. Appropriately generated feeling states would serve as a motivation to pursue reasonable behavior or action. Emerging naturally out of "rational" emotions would be "rational" desires and "rational" behavior.



When searching for the ingredients necessary for a highly rational life, it is therefore crucial not to underestimate the role of the affective dimension of mind. To engage in high quality reasoning, one must have not only the cognitive ability to do so, but the drive to do so as well. One must feel the importance of doing so, and thus be driven to acquire command of the art of high quality reasoning. What is more, it is evident that to learn to solve problems effectively, one must have the desire to do so. One must be committed to it. Thus the affective dimension, comprised of feelings and volition, is a necessary condition and component of high quality reasoning and problem solving. Every "defect" in emotion and drive creates a "defect" in thought and reason. Intelligence on this view, then, presupposes and requires command of the affective dimension of mind. In short, the truly intelligent person is not a disembodied intellect functioning in an emotional wilderness, but a deeply committed mindful person, full of passion and high values, engaged in effective reasoning, sound judgment, and wise conduct.

A Practical Theory Of Mind

The ability to reason about the knowledge, beliefs, intentions, and emotions is a uniquely human capability that seems to develop in a distinct pattern of emerging belief-desire psychology. The study of our capacity to reason about other people's minds has become the focus of cognitive neuroscience research. The human mind is comprised of three basic functions: cognition, feelings, and volition. The cognitive component of the mind includes mental actions we traditionally link with thinking such as analyzing, comparing, assuming, inferring, questioning, contrasting, evaluating, etc. The cognitive function is concerned with conceptualizing, reasoning, and figuring things out.

The feeling (or emotional) function is that part of the mind which is our internal monitor, which informs us of how we are doing in any given situation or set of circumstances. It is our gauge for telling us whether we are doing well or poorly. Because we are emotionally complex, humans experience a broad array of emotions from happiness to sadness, from enthusiasm to depression, from joy to sorrow, from satisfaction to frustration, and so on.

The third function of the mind, our ultimate driving force, is the formation of volition or will. Within this function lie our agendas, purposes, goals, values, desires, drives, motivations and commitments. This is the mind's engine, which revs us up and moves us forward toward some action, slows us down, or leads us to back away from some action. As our driving force, desires, volition, and play a key role in determining our behavior.

These three basic mental functions, albeit theoretically distinct, operate in a dynamic relationship to each other, ever influencing one another in mutual and reciprocal ways. Thus, although they serve different roles, they are concomitant and interdependent. They function so intimately in our experience that it is only theoretically that we can regard them distinctively. Wherever there is thinking, some related drive and feeling exist. Wherever there is feeling, some related thinking and drive can be found. Wherever there is drive, thinking and feeling are present in some form.



Despite the fact that cognition, feeling and volition are equally important functions of the mind, it is cognition, or thinking, which is the key to the other two. If we want to change a feeling, we must identify the thinking that ultimately leads to the feeling. If we want to change a desire, again it is the thinking underlying the drive that must be identified and altered-if our behavior is to alter.

It is our thinking that leads us toward or away from some action, and in the last analysis sets us up for some given emotional evaluation of the situation.

Is It A Feeling Or Is It An Emotion

Emotions and feelings are often spoken of as being one and the same, and it's easy to get them mixed up and confused. Aristotle says emotions are judgments. Spinoza says emotions are judgments plus feelings of pain or pleasure. Descartes says they are judgments brought on by felt changes in the animal spirits. Philosophers usually presume that emotions are cognitive. A cognitive theory of the emotions is one according to which emotions essentially involve cognitions. Cognitions are usually regarded as propositional attitudes, such as beliefs or judgments, but they can also be mere conceptualizations.

According to some cognitive theorists, fear involves the thought that I am in danger, and according to others it merely involves deployment of the concept danger without necessarily having a fully formed thought. Some cognitive philosophers, such as Descartes, admit that emotions are not merely cognitions; cognitions are just one component. But this is sufficient reason for rejecting the feeling theory. If emotions have a cognitive component, either an attitude or a concept, then they cannot be merely feelings. Concepts and attitudes are not feelings. There is a discrete element about whether categorizing of concepts and attitudes can even be conscious, and many emotion theorists assume that emotional cognitions are generally unconscious. But if concepts and feelings can be conscious it does not follow that these mental episodes are feelings. The term feeling is usually reserved for a special class of non-conceptual mental states. If feelings are non-conceptual, and emotions have essential cognitive components, then emotions are not feelings, though they may have feelings as parts.

There is no scientific evidence of the claim that emotions are feelings based on conceptual analysis. Concepts are grounded in paradigm cases and in ordinary language emotions are paradigm cases of feelings. We can often use the term emotion and feeling interchangeably. While some languages lack a word for 'emotion,' all languages have a word for 'feeling' (Wierzbicka, 1999). In languages with no word for emotion, there are still words for particular emotions, and speakers of such languages call those emotions feelings. The main significant difference between feeling and emotion seems to be that the former term is broader. Some feelings are not emotions and we have some exclusively somatic feelings for e.g. nausea,



chilliness, itchiness and so on but in ordinary parlance all emotions are feelings. Psychologists have claimed that ordinary language is not committed to the view that emotions are feelings but merely to the view that emotions can be felt. When we say, 'I feel angry' we don't mean to imply that anger is a feeling. We mean rather to imply that we have a feeling of the kind that we have when we are angry. 'I feel X' does not entail 'X is a feeling'.

The issue of unconscious emotions puts us back into the sphere of ordinary language. We do not seem to have a tendency of referring to unconscious emotional states that even Freud didn't consider emotions could be unconscious. He thought we are often unconscious of the cause of an emotion but the emotion itself has to be conscious. In ordinary narrative, we rarely talk about unconscious pains. But it must be evoked that rational does not recognize the existence of unconscious thoughts or perceptions. Even very aesthetical refined philosophers had been reluctant historically to admit that unconscious mental states exist. Attitudes changed decisively under the pressure of evidence and assuming unconscious mental states explains behaviour.

The most obvious demonstration of this is subliminal perception. If a stimulus is displayed briefly, followed by a mask, we have no conscious experience of it. However, the stimulus can affect subsequent behaviour. Obviously something is going on unconsciously and moreover, whatever is going on is the result of the fact that the stimulus was presented to our senses. Stimulus detection through a sense organ is in essence what perception is all about. The fact that perception is often conscious is interesting and important but it is not essential. What makes perceptual states qualify as perceptual is their etiology i.e. the role of sensory transduction from the world outside the mind. So, even if we began thinking that all mentality is conscious, the case of subliminal perception is easy to absorb. It is easy to get comfortable with the idea that something very much like conscious perception occurs without consciousness. When subliminal perception was discovered, we could have made a terminological stipulation that it is not a form of perception. We could have reserved the word perception for conscious sensing and coined a new term for the subliminal case. But we didn't go that route because we recognized that the similarities between subliminal and conscious perception were so great that it would be useful to categorize both under the same term. The discovery of subliminal perception may have forced us to change the concept of perception by adopting a policy about whether it should be used to encompass unconscious states.

If there are mental states that functions just like pain but lack consciousness, it is useful to group them together with conscious pains. Pain carries information from nociceptors and leads to withdrawal and soothing behaviours. If there are mental episodes that play that role without awareness, we should call them unconscious pains. And the same goes for emotions. If there are inner states that registered patterned bodily change under conditions that cause conscious emotions in us, and those inner states lead to characteristic coping behaviors, such as approach and avoidance, we should call these states unconscious emotions.



But do such states exist? Firstly, perceptual systems in general seem to allow unconscious perception. We can have unconscious visual states, unconscious auditory states, unconscious tactile states, and so on. It seems overwhelmingly likely, then, that we can have unconscious perceptions of the patterned bodily changes that constitute our emotions. If emotions are interoceptive states then it seems likely that emotions can be unconscious.

Secondly, there is anecdotal evidence for unconscious emotions. For example, imagine being woken up by the sound of glass shattering in your living room. You might assume that burglars are breaking in and attend intensely to the sound. At the very same time, your body will undoubtedly enter into a fear pattern, but you might not experience the fear consciously because attention is consumed elsewhere. After waiting to hear if there is any more noise, you hear your cat scurrying about and you realize she must have knocked over a vase. You then notice, and only then, that your heart is racing, and your breathing is strained, and your entire body is tensed in fear. You were afraid, but you didn't realize it. Now you breathe a sigh of relief.

Thirdly, there is some experimental evidence for unconscious emotions. In a representative study, Winkielman et al. (2005) subliminally presented subjects with photographs of emotional facial expressions. Subjects saw faces that were either neutral, angry, or happy, but the faces were presented too rapidly to be consciously experienced. Subjects were then given a fruity beverage and asked to pour a glass, and take a sip. They were also asked some questions about the beverage and about their feelings. Subjects who had seen the angry face and the happy face reported being in the same mood and the same level of arousal. On measures of conscious emotional feeling, they were statistically identical. But, the faces did affect their behaviour. Subjects who had seen the angry face poured less of the beverage, drank less of it, and gave it less positive ratings than subjects who had seen the smiling face. This suggests that an emotion had been induced. Emotions are known to impact behaviour in this way. So this is plausibly a case of unconscious emotions.

So, there are good theoretical, anecdotal, and experimental reasons for believing that emotions can be unconscious. This suggests that emotions are not always felt and when emotions are felt, the feeling is the emotion: the emotion is a conscious perception of a patterned change in the body. But emotions can go unfelt as they can be unconscious perceptions of patterned changes in the body.

The primary belief in the philosophy of emotions is that emotions are not feelings. There is an important sense in which this principle is false. When emotions are felt, those feelings are the emotions. But the principle also has a light of truth. Emotions can be unfelt. So there are some emotions, the unconscious ones that are not feelings. Only some emotions are feelings. But, broadly all emotions are feelings potentially. All emotions are perceptions of bodily states, and those perceptions can be conscious. So, there is no example of an emotion that could not, under the right conditions, be a feeling.



Neural Activity Generate Emotional Feelings

How feelings are created is the most important question in basic emotion research, although it has hardly been addressed empirically, it is the source of acute philosophical and psychological debate. Without affect, we might not feel alive and we humans would have little to talk about and no special reason to reach out to others. Affect motivates our urge to play and to speak i.e. when one of the highest brain regions that encodes sadness, anguish, and social bonding, the anterior cingulate, is damaged, people fall into akinetic mutism. Such unfortunates retain the physical capacity to speak, but they have no urge or wish to communicate (Devinsky, Morrell, & Vogt, 1995).

Affects fill the mind with a large variety of desirable and undesirable experienced states that are hard to define objectively or to talk about clearly. Partly this is because raw affects are pre-propositional forms of consciousness comprising brain and bodily processes of kaleidoscopic complexity. But there seem to be several distinct types. Some accompany major bodily disturbances (e.g., pain and fatigue); some reflect sensory pleasures and displeasures (ranging from tasty delights to disgust); still others gauge bodily need states (e.g., hunger and thirst); and perhaps most mysteriously, certain intrinsic brain-body arousal states are strongly valenced i.e. the emotional affects.

The description contains at least three distinct types (1) sensory affects, (2) bodily-homeostatic ones, and (3) brain emotional ones. Each is initially expressed at primary-process levels, but during development they come to include learned object relations (secondary-process affects) and get linked to thoughts and other cognitive activities (tertiary-process affects). Many scientist differ and there are bound to be conceptual disagreements concerning where certain entities belong. For instance, disgust should not be considered a primary-process emotion; it fits better in other categories, and only through learning might it be deemed a secondary or tertiary process emotion (Panksepp, 2007a, Toronchuk & Ellis, 2007b). In other words, when the affective power of primary sensory or homeostatic disgust/nausea is cognitively resymbolized, social disgust may emerge as a socially constructed emotion.

The basic emotional affects are primary brain/mind processes, similar to seeing a color. One can use a word, like "red," as a label for a color, but this word does not explain the experience of seeing red. If someone is blind, the word "red" is meaningless. In order to explain seeing red, one must discover the neurophysiological and neurochemical causes of visual experience. Similarly, one cannot use words to explain primary-process raw emotions. Words can only be used as second-order symbols to discuss affective experiences, but they do not adequately capture the fundamental causes of feelings. Like first-order sensory experiences, primary-process affects are best understood if we clarify the attending brain functions.



Thinking Mind With The Rational Mind

According to Daniel Goleman sensory signals from eye or ear travel first in the brain to the thalamus and then across a single synapse to the amygdala; a second signal from the thalamus is routed to the neocortex the thinking brain. This branching allows the amygdala to begin to respond before the neocortex, which mulls information through several levels of brain circuits before it fully perceives and finally initiates its more finely tailored response.

Based on this description of brain activity Goleman concludes that we have two minds, one that thinks and one that feels. These two fundamentally different ways of knowing interact to construct our mental life. In a sense we have two brains, two minds and two different kinds of intelligence i.e. rational and emotional. The emotional mind is far quicker than the rational mind, springing into action without pausing even a moment to consider what it is doing. Its velocity precludes the deliberate, analytic reflection that is the hallmark of the thinking mind. The more intense the feeling, the more dominant the emotional mind becomes and the more ineffectual the rational mind.

The beliefs of the rational mind are tentative, new evidence can disconfirm one belief and replace it with a new one it reasons by objective evidence. The emotional mind, however, takes its beliefs to be absolutely true, and so discounts any evidence to the contrary. Actions that spring from the emotional mind carry a particularly strong sense of certainty, a by-product of a streamlined, simplified way of looking at things that can be absolutely bewildering to the rational mind. Emotional hijackings occur when a center in the limbic brain proclaims an emergency, recruiting the rest of the brain to its urgent agenda. The hijacking occurs an instant before the neocortex, the thinking brain, has had a chance to fully glimpse what is happening which happens to us fairly frequently. The amygdala's extensive web of neural connections allows it, during an emotional emergency, to capture and drive much of the rest of the brain including the rational mind.

Certain predictable emotional reactions are typically a product of egocentric thinking. Emotions that are commonly egocentric include defensiveness, irritability, arrogance, anger, apathy, indifference, alienation, resentment, and depression. Of course, to determine whether a particular emotion is irrational or rational, one must look closely at the thinking that ultimately drives that emotion, not at the emotion in-and-of itself.

Functions Of Emotions

Emotions were most often defined, implicitly or explicitly, in terms of specific response components i.e. appraisal themes, action tendencies, nonverbal displays, particular subjective states or feelings, or autonomic nervous system profiles (Calhoun & Solomon, 1984). Emotions in terms of functions enable the individual to respond effectively to environmental challenges



and opportunities. Anger is more than just a specific family of facial expressions or patterns of neural activation; it is a set of coordinated responses that help restore just relations. Embarrassment is more than the blush or the pronounced desire to hide; it is a form of appeasement. Joy can be understood as motivating readiness for novel exploits and expanding competences. Sadness may serve disengagement from attachments after personal loss. Irrational-seeming emotions like compassion and desire for revenge serve adaptive purposes i.e. they represent one's commitment, and signal others that one may act upon them; they thereby outweigh occasional costs in short term interaction (Frank, 1988).

This importance on function has shaped the field of emotion in several ways. It has broadened existing classification of emotion, particularly directing researchers to the systematic study of several more social emotions such as compassion, gratitude and fear. It has led appraisal researchers to engage in problem analyses for the different emotions (e.g., Tooby & Cosmides, 2000), articulating how each emotion is tailored to a prototypical challenge for survival or reproduction (e.g., Barrett & Campos, 1987; Ekman, 1992; Frijda, 1988; Keltner & Haidt, 2001; Lazarus, 1991). A functional emphasis also sheds light on an array of specific findings by linking particular components of an emotional response to particular evolutionary problems and opportunities. For example, anger is associated with enhanced distribution of blood to the hands, whereas fear involves less blood flow to the periphery (Levenson, 1992). This finding only makes sense when one considers what is needed to fight an enemy, versus escaping an attack with minimal loss of blood.

Not every instance of an emotion will reveal the functions it evolved to serve. Particular occurrences of fear, embarrassment or anger may lead to maladaptive behavior, poorly tailored to the demands of the immediate context and false positives (e.g., chronic shame for a disability, attachment to a security blanket) are quite common. An evolutionary approach does not demand that every emotional response be explained in terms of survival and reproductive fitness. Indeed, many evolved behaviors, functional in the appropriate context can be elicited as a false positive by a similar but inappropriate stimulus, or can be dysfunctional in certain situations (Rose, 1998; Tomkins, 1984). Thus, it is not necessary to articulate the fitness value of human responses to kittens and puppies in order to demonstrate the evolutionary value of compassion. It is more likely that nurturant responses toward one's own young and young kin are selected for and that biological kin recognition systems are far from perfect (Rose, 1998; Tomkins, 1984).

Emotions affect not only our mental state but also different areas of the body. These conscious feelings help individuals fine tune their behavior to better match the challenges of the environment. Anxiety may be experienced as pain in the chest, for example, whereas compassion may be associated with reducing distress of vulnerable individuals. It is thought that this activation of body areas gets us ready to react swiftly to dangers, or pleasurable opportunities, present in the environment around us. Scientists are investigating whether our emotions trigger these bodily changes, or if it is our perception of these bodily changes that generates the felt emotions. Studies reveal that consistent patterns of bodily sensations are associated with each of



the six basic emotions, and that these sensations are represented in a categorical manner in the body. They are in line with the evidence from brain imaging and behavioral studies, highlighting categorical structure of emotion systems and neural circuits supporting emotional processing.

The most basic emotions are associated with sensations of elevated activity in the upper chest area, likely corresponding to changes in breathing and heart rate. Similarly, sensations in the head area were shared across all emotions, reflecting both physiological changes in the facial area (i.e., facial musculature activation, skin temperature) as well as the felt changes in the contents of mind triggered by the emotional events. Sensations in the upper limbs were most prominent in approach-oriented emotions, anger and happiness, whereas sensations of decreased limb activity were a defining feature of sadness. Sensations in the digestive system and around the throat region were mainly found in disgust. Thus, somatosensation and embodiment play critical roles in emotional processing unraveling the subjective bodily sensations associated with human emotions which helps us to understand mood disorders such as depression and anxiety, and could thus provide a fresh biomarker for emotional disorders.

Emotional Intelligence In Context

Emotional intelligence is a relatively new concept discovered as a result of a series of studies undertaken by researchers and psychologists in an attempt to understand why people who are intellectually the most intelligent, in the traditional sense of the word, are often not the ones who are the most successful in life.

Emotional intelligence brings together the fields of emotions and intelligence by viewing emotions as useful sources of information that help one to make sense of and navigate the social environment. Specifically, emotional intelligence is a set of interrelated skills that allows people to process emotionally relevant information efficiently and accurately (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999).

Key components of emotional intelligence includes – Self-awareness, Self-management (including Motivation), Social awareness skills such as Empathy, and Social skills.

The first component of emotional intelligence is emotional self-awareness, knowing what one feels. John Mayer uses the term meta-mood, the affective analogue of meta-cognition, for key aspects of emotional self-awareness. The neural substrates of emotional self-awareness have yet to be determined with precision. But Antonio Damasio (1994), on the basis of neuropsychological studies of patients with brain lesions, proposes that the ability to sense, articulate, and reflect on one's emotional states hinges on the neural circuits that run between the prefrontal and verbal cortex, the amygdala, and the viscera. Patients with lesions that disconnect the amygdala from the prefrontal cortex, he finds, are at a loss to give words to feelings, a hallmark of the disorder alexithymia. In some ways, alexithymia and emotional self-awareness



may be mirror concepts, one reflecting a deficiency in the workings of these neural substrates, the other efficiency (Taylor, Parker, & Bagby, 1999).

The second component of emotional intelligence, emotional self-management, is the ability to regulate distressing affects like anxiety and anger and to inhibit emotional impulsivity. PET (positron-emission tomography) measurements of glucose metabolism reveal that individual differences in metabolic activity in the amygdala are associated with levels of distress or dysphoria, the more activity, the greater the negative affect (Davidson, Jackson, & Kalin, 2000). In contrast, metabolic activity in the left medial prefrontal cortex is inversely related to levels of activity in the amygdala, an array of inhibitory neurons in the prefrontal area, animal studies have shown, regulate activation of the amygdala. In humans, the greater the activity level in the left medial prefrontal cortex, the more positive the person's emotional state. Thus a major locus of the ability to regulate negative affect appears to be the circuit between the amygdala and the left prefrontal cortex.

David McClelland (1975) has defined motivation as "an affectively toned associative network arranged in a hierarchy of strength and importance in the individual," which determines what goals we seek. Davidson proposes that the left medial prefrontal cortex is the site of "affective working memory." Damage to this region is associated with a loss of the ability to sustain goal-directed behavior; loss of the capacity to anticipate affective outcomes from accomplishing goals diminishes the ability to guide behavior adaptively (Davidson, Jackson, & Kalin, 2000). In other words, Davidson proposes that the prefrontal cortex allows us to hold in mind or remind ourselves of the positive feelings that will come when we attain our goals and at the same time allows us to inhibit the negative feelings that would discourage us from continuing to strive toward those goals.

Social Awareness, the third emotional intelligence component, which encompasses the competency of Empathy, also involves the amygdala. Studies of patients with discrete lesions to the amygdala show impairment of their ability to read nonverbal cues for negative emotions, particularly anger and fear, and to judge the trustworthiness of other people (Davidson, Jackson, & Kalin, 2000). Brothers (1989), reviewing both neurological findings and comparative studies with primates, cites data showing that certain neurons in the visual cortex respond only to specific emotional cues, such as a threat. These emotion-recognition cortical neurons have strong connections to the amygdala.

Finally, Social skill, the fourth emotional intelligence component, poses a more complex picture. In a fundamental sense, the effectiveness of our relationship skills hinges on our ability to attune ourselves to or influence the emotions of another person. That ability in turn builds on other domains of emotional intelligence, particularly self-management and social awareness. If we cannot control our emotional outbursts or impulses and lack empathy, there is less chance we will be effective in our relationships.



Indeed, in an analysis of data on workplace effectiveness, it has been found that emotional self-awareness is a prerequisite for effective self-management, which in turn predicts greater social skill. A secondary pathway runs from self-awareness to social awareness (particularly empathy) to social skill. Managing relationships well, then, depends on a foundation of self-management and empathy, each of which in turn requires self-awareness.

This evidence that empathy and self-management are foundations for social effectiveness finds support at the neurological level. Patients with lesions in the prefrontal-amygdala circuits that undergird both self-management and empathy show marked deficits in relationship skills, even though their cognitive abilities remain intact (Damasio, 1994).

Psychological Perspective Of Emotional Intelligence

Conventional intelligence tells us that IQ is the best of a youth success in life (Gorg, 2000). Goleman (1996) asserted that most IQ contributes about 20% to the factor that determine success leaving 8% to other factors. These other factors make up what is called emotional intelligence. Our society faces a number of economic, health-related, ethnic-racial, cultural, geopolitical and environmental challenges. Most agree that solutions to society's most vexing problems will require citizens to possess not only well-developed intellectual abilities, but also equally impressive social and emotional skills. It is this recognition of the importance of proficient interpersonal skills and the ability to get along effectively with others that has helped fuel the growing interest in the concept of emotional intelligence (Steven, 2001).

A second reason for the growing interest in the concept of emotional intelligence has to do with recent theories embracing more broad conceptualizations of intelligence (Gardner, 1983; Sternberg, 1988). Over the past hundred years, most theories of intelligence (Binet & Simon, 1916; Thurstone, 1938; Wechsler, 1958; Spearman, 1923) have posited the preeminence of one general ability, *g*, at the apex of a hierarchical model (Brody, 1992). This general factor, *g*, represents what many psychometric researchers feel is the primary mental ability, underlying what all different kinds of intelligence tests have in common (Keith, 1994).

Emotional intelligence is the innate potential to feel, use, communicate, recognize, remember, learn from, manage, understand and explain emotions. The word 'describe' also includes describing emotions to oneself, in order to better understand them, etc., and not merely communication or explanation of emotions to others. The description of an emotion really comprises the use of metaphors and analogies, including comparison with other, similar emotions, and all manner of other analogous things, in order to better incorporate an emotion into one's verbal and intellectual understanding, so that it can be really focused on as a matter of concentration (Goleman, 2003).



The description of feelings using metaphors form part of the basis of human language. It helps refine our understanding of feelings by comparing feelings to concrete things and already extant mental concepts. EQ is an abbreviation for "emotional quotient," the measure of emotional intelligence, and it means being smart with feelings. Some people just know how to get along with others; some people are more self-confident, and others are great at inspiring others. All these come from a set of skills called emotional intelligence, or EQ. Some other EQ skills are identifying and changing emotions, motivating you, and empathizing with another person. Emotional intelligence is a set of measurable and learnable skills essential for success in school, work, and life (Kathy, 2001).

Successively more specific mental abilities constitute the lower strata or levels of generality, depending upon the particular theory. Fluid and crystallized intelligence is one example (Horn, 1976) and verbal-comprehension and nonverbal-perceptual-spatial abilities are another (Wechsler, 1991). These traditional theories of intelligence, although quite varied, share a small number of consensual attributes. They all agree that intelligence is goal-directed mental activity that is marked by efficient problem solving, critical thinking, and effective abstract reasoning (Sternberg, 1986).

Traditionally, the study of intelligence or human abilities has largely focused on cognitive abilities and their adaptive uses (Piaget, 1950). In recent years, more encompassing approaches to the study of intelligence have gradually gained widespread acceptance through the works of many theorists, including, among others, Gardner (1983, 1999a), and Sternberg (1988, 1996). Along this line, it is believed that the notion of intelligence should be expanded to include not only cognitive abilities but also the experience and expression of emotions (Barrett & Gross, 2001; Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999).

The intrigue of why some people become successful while others fail despite natural talents, gifts, or intelligence has provoked inquiry into qualities that determine success. While some people possess varying degrees of ability, oftentimes the most talented are not always the most successful, happy, or wealthy, which goes against our rational way of thinking. Although it is premature to conclude that emotional intelligence plays a key role in determining life success, it is proposed that there may be a significant relationship.

Emotional intelligence is very important in every educational, sociological, economical etc. organizations and environments, because organizations today continually need to undergo rapid change to maintain their competitive edge. That rapid change requires an organization that has employees and leaders who are adaptive, work effectively, constantly improve systems and processes, are customer focused, and who share the need to make a profit. The continuous environment of turmoil and change has been coined the permanent white waters of modern life (Vaill, 1996). A key element in driving and managing these white waters in an organization is believed by many to be leadership. Great leaders ignite our passion and inspire the best in us. When we try to explain why they are so effective, we speak of strategy, vision, or powerful



ideas. But the reality is much more primal i.e. great leadership works through the emotions (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).

Primarily two perspectives of emotional intelligence have emerged over the past decade i.e. one that is based more on a mixed perspective, which defines emotional intelligence largely through personality characteristics; the second perspective is an ability perspective, which defines emotional intelligence as a set of distinct abilities. Since there has been more research in the area of personality characteristics and leadership. The ability model of emotional intelligence is framed as a type of intelligence, hence it is intended to co-exist with, supplement, and clarify existing models of leadership and not replace them. Though the model is too new to have extensive data in support of its predictive validity, it is believed that it will make significant contributions to our understanding of leadership (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2002). Leadership, which embraces the emotional side of directing organizations, pumps life and meaning into management structures, bringing them to full life (Barach & Eckhardt, 2007).

Emotional intelligence isn't a new concept in psychology. One can find related ideas in work done over 60 years ago (Cary, 2002). For instance, Robert Thorndike wrote about "social intelligence" in the late thirties. He defined social intelligence as "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human relations." (Thorndike & Stein, 1937). In addition, David Weschsler recognized non-cognitive features of intelligence as necessary for adaptation and achievement. In the early 1940's, Weschsler presented the idea of "non-intellective" and "intellective" factors. He also proposed that the "non-intellective" factors, such as effective, personal, and social factors, were necessary for predicting a person's aptitude for accomplishment (John & Lori, 2005).

Then in the early 1980s, the idea of emotional intelligence resurfaced. Howard Gardner suggested that all human beings possess a number of intelligences, each of which appears to be housed in a different part of the brain. Gardner's ideas came to be known as the Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Within his concept of multiple intelligences, he proposed the "interpersonal" and "intrapersonal" intelligence are as important as cognitive elements of intelligence. Interpersonal intelligence, or people smart, affords those who have a gift of understanding, appreciating, and getting along well with others. Intrapersonal intelligence, on the other hand, is the ability to understand yourself, knowing who and what you are, and how you fit into the greater scheme of the universe (Gardner, 2000).

In 1990, Salovey published a paper in which they used the term "emotional intelligence" for the first time. They defined emotional intelligence as, the ability to perceive and express emotions, to understand and use them, and to manage emotions in oneself and other people (Salovey, Bedell, Detweiler, & Mayer, 1999). During the next few years they did a number of laboratory and field-based studies of this "new" concept (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1998). Finally, the emotional intelligence concept was popularized in 1990 by the publication of Daniel Goleman's book, *Emotional Intelligence*. Goleman's ideas of emotional intelligence include Howard



Gardner's interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, as well as other necessary facilities (Goleman, 1990).

Consistent with Baron (1982) and Dewey's (1933) earlier conceptions of reflective thinking, Sternberg (1999) writes – Among the core mental processes that may be key in any culture or other environmental context are (a) recognizing the existence of the problem, (b) defining the nature of the problem, (c) constructing a strategy to solve the problem, (d) mentally representing information about the problem, (e) allocating mental resources in solving the problem, (f) monitoring one's solution to the problem, and (g) evaluating one's solution to the problem. Gardner (1999b) asserted that emotional intelligence includes self-discipline and the ability to control impulses. The characteristics of emotional intelligence include those qualities that are predictors for successful functioning in society. These characteristics are described as being self-assured and interested; knowing what kind of behavior is expected and how to control the impulse to misbehave; and being able to wait and delay gratification, to follow directions, to turn to leaders for help, and to express needs while getting along with peers.

Conclusion

If we are concerned with developing our rationality in order to improve our lives, we must understand the powerful role that both emotions and thoughts play in our minds. We must understand the ways in which affect and cognition influence one another in determining both our outlook on life and our behavior. Most importantly, we must come to terms with those truths about the human mind that enable us to begin the process of taking charge of our minds: that thoughts and emotions are inextricably bound, that we have both egocentric and rational tendencies, that our inner conflicts are never best understood as a simple matter between emotion and reason, that self-command of mind takes both extended education and self-discipline, that our fullest rational development is dependent on the development of rational affect, that to bring intelligence to bear upon emotions we must take charge of the thinking underlying those emotions.

These important insights are more obscured than illuminated by analyses of the mind such as that offered by Daniel Goleman. To develop our awareness of the nature of the human mind and how it functions we must be careful not to over-emphasize the importance of brain research. Our most important knowledge of the human mind will always be, ultimately, knowledge drawn from the multiple constructs of the mind.

References

1. Binet, A., & Simon, T. (1916). *The development of intelligence in children*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.



2. Baron, J. (1982). *Personality and intelligence*. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.). *Handbook of human intelligence* (pp. 308–351). New York: Cambridge University Press.
3. Barrett, K.C., & Campos, J.J. (1987). *Perspectives on emotional development II: A functionalist approach to emotions*. In J. D. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (2nd ed., pp. 558-578). New York: Wiley.
4. Brothers, L. (1989). A biological perspective on empathy. **American Journal of Psychiatry**, 146(1), 10-19.
5. Brody, N. (1992). *Intelligence*. Boston, MA: Academic Press.
6. Barrett, L.F., & Gross, J.J. (2001). *Emotional intelligence: A process model of emotion representation and regulation*. New York: IT Press.
7. Barach, J., & Eckhardt, D. (2007). *Leadership and the job of the executive*. Westpor, CT: Quorum Books.
8. Calhoun, C., & Solomon, R.C. (1984). Introduction. In C. Calhoun & R .C. Solomon (Eds.), *What is an emotion: Readings in philosophical psychology* (pp.3-40). New York : Oxford University Press.
9. Campos, J.J., Mumme, D.L., Kermoian, R., & Campos, R.G. (1994). A functionalist perspective on the nature of emotion. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), *The development of emotion regulation: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59, 284-303.
10. Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A.Y.C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Journal of Psychology*, 30, 539-561.
11. Cary, C. (2002). Emotional intelligence. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30 (1), 1-14.
12. Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: Heath.
13. Damasio, A. (1994). ***Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain***. New York: Grosset/Putnam.
14. Devinsky, O., Morrell, M.J., & Vogt, B.A. (1995). Contributions of anterior cingulate to behavior. *Brain*, 118, 279–306.



15. Davidson, R.J., Jackson, D.C. & Kalin, N.H. (2000). Emotion, plasticity, context and regulation: Perspectives from affective neuroscience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 890-906.
16. Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*. 6, 169-200.
17. Frank, R.H. (1988). *Passions within reason: The strategic role of the emotions*. New York: Norton.
18. Frijda, N. (1988). The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 43, 349-358.
19. Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.
20. Goleman, D. (1996). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York : Bantam Books.
21. Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books.
22. Gardner, H. (1999a). *Intelligence refrained*. New York: Basic Books.
23. Gardner, H. (1999b). *Are there additional intelligences? The case for naturalist, spiritual, and existential intelligences*. In J. Kane (Ed.), *Education, information, and transformation* (pp. 111–131). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
24. Gardner, H. (2000). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books.
25. Gorg, S.W. (2000). *Enhancing emotional intelligence and social adeptness*. Master's Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University.
26. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
27. Goleman, D. (2003). *Destructive emotions. How can overcome them?* New York: Bantam Books.
28. Horn, J.L. (1976). Human abilities: A review of research and theory in the early 1970's. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 27, 437-485.
29. John, A., & Lori. R. (2005). The analysis of the emotional intelligence skills and potential problem areas of elementary educators. *Journal of Education*, 125(4), 615 – 623.



30. Keith, T.Z. (1994). Intelligence is important, intelligence is complex. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 9, 209-221.
31. Kathy, N. (2001). Emotional Intelligence and Social Skills: Necessary Components of Hands-On Learning in Science Classes. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, 13 (2), 22- 34.
32. Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2001). Social functions of emotions. In T. Mayne & G. Bonanno (Eds.), *Emotions: Current issues and future directions* (pp. 192-213). New York: Guilford.
33. Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
34. Levenson, R.W. (1992). Autonomic nervous system differences among emotions. *Psychological Science*, 3, 23-27. (1).
35. McClelland, D.C. (1975). *Power: The Inner Experience*. NY Irvington.
36. Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1998). The multifactor emotional intelligence scale. *Journal of Intelligence*, 28, 150–162.
37. Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267-298.
38. Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT): Users Manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi Health Systems, Inc.
39. Piaget, J. (1950). *The Psychology of intelligence*. Routledge, London, N.D Publisher.
40. Panksepp, J. (2007). Criteria for basic emotions: Is DISGUST a primary "emotion"? *Cognition and Emotion*, 21, 1819-1828.
41. Rose, M.R. (1998). *Darwin's Spectre: Evolutionary Biology in the Modern World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
42. Spearman, A. (1923). *The nature of intelligence and the principles of cognition*. London: Macmillan.
43. Sternberg, R.J. (1988). *The trial mind: A new theory of human intelligence*. New York: Viking.
44. Sternberg, R.J. (1996). *Successful intelligence*. New York: Plume.



45. Salovey, P., Bedell, B., Detweiler, J.B., & Mayer, J.D. (1999). *Coping intelligently: Emotional intelligence and the coping process*. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works* (pp. 141-164). New York: Oxford University press.
46. Sternberg, R.J. (1999). The theory of successful intelligence. *Review of General Psychology*, 3, 292–316.
47. Steven, I. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Popular but elusive construct. *Journal of Roeper Review*, 23 (3), 138 – 149.
48. Thorndike, R., & Stein, S. (1937). Evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34, 275–284.
49. Thurstone, L.L. (1938). *Primary mental abilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
50. Tomkins, S.S. (1984). Affect Theory. In K. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to Emotion* (pp. 163-195). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
51. Taylor, G.J., Parker, J.D.A., and Bagby, R.M. (1999). Emotional intelligence and the emotional brain: Points of convergence and implications for psychoanalysis. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 27(3), 339-354.
52. Tooby, J. & Cosmides, L. (2000). Evolutionary psychology and the emotions. In M. Lewis & J.M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions, Second Edition*. (pp. 91-115). New York: Guilford.
53. Toronchuk, J.A. & Ellis, G.F.R. (2007b). Criteria for basic emotions: Seeking DISGUST? *Cognition and Emotion*, 21, 1829-1832.
54. Vaill, P.B. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
55. Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence* (4th Ed.). Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
56. Wechsler, D. (1991). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
57. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across Languages and Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research

ISSN: 2349-5677

Volume 1, Issue 2, July 2014

58. Winkielman, P., Berridge, K. C., & Wilbarger, J. L. (2005). Unconscious affective reactions to masked happy versus angry faces influence consumption behavior and judgments of value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *1*, 121-135.